REMARKS

Claims 2-22 are pending, in addition to new claims 23 and 24. The independent claims are claims 2, 10-15, 19, 23, and 24. All of the claims are rejected as obvious from *Teresawa* (U.S. Patent No. 6,147,714) in view of Admitted Prior Art (APA at page 6, lines 1-10 of the application), and *Eyer* (U.S. Patent No. 5,982,445).

The key point of the present invention is that the broadcast transmission stream and the respective broadcast service and all respective data of the broadcasting (which enables the receiver to receive the broadcast transmission, the broadcast stream, and the broadcast service) are assigned with a worldwide textual service identifier.

Eyer at col. 7 line 62 – col. 8 line 32 discloses that the HTML data is included in a transport stream, and that the transport stream is broadcast to the user. However, *Eyer* does not disclose that the broadcast service delivered by the broadcast transmission stream would be identified by non-numerically descriptive worldwide globally individual identifying name information. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that the penultimate sentence on page 3 of the Advisory Action is not dispositive. Col. 7 lines 17-24 of *Eyer* disclose as follows:

> "[p]rovision may be made for interactivity such that a user can interact with a processor which operates using commands similar to a web browser. That is, the user can enter or select a function parameters field using an input device such as a mouse, other pointing device, infrared transmitter, or keyboard. The processor receives the function parameters field entered, appends the filed to a URL, and transmits a request back to a server."

Further, col. 7 line 67and col. 8 lines 13-14 of *Eyer* disclose that HTML/HTVP data is included/multiplexed with the programming services audio/video data. However, the above portions of *Eyer* do not disclose that the broadcast transmission stream itself is identified by non-numerically descriptive worldwide globally individual identifying name information.

The primary relevant thing that *Eyer* discloses is that URL-based Web-TV service is included in the programming services audio/video data (col. 7 lines 67 and col. 8 lines 13-14), and after that the transport stream (carrying the URL-based information) is broadcast to the user (col. 8 lines 16-32). In *Eyer*, the transport stream is not identified by a worldwide textual

identifier. The transport stream of *Eyer* is the conventional numerically identifiable non-global transport stream.

In addition, the Web-TV links of *Eyer* identify and relate to web server based services on the Internet, which are delivered by the old transport stream, which is not identifiable based on text and which is not worldwide. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the services of *Eyer* do not relate to the present claimed broadcast services.

Further Remarks

Applicants fully agree that the URL at column 7, line 35 is a worldwide global identifier. However, the manner of delivery disclosed by the present claimed invention is different from the example in col. 7 of *Eyer*. In particular, the service of *Eyer* is not a broadcast stream-based service, as in the present claimed invention. The first sentence of the present application points out that the present invention involves a "broadcast," and this is also pointed out in several of the claims. Of course, "broadcasting" means to send information to two or more receiving devices simultaneously. See *Newton's Telecom Dictionary*, 16th Expanded and Updated Edition, page 122. In contrast, *Eyer* discloses a system in which different users access the same information whenever each one wants.

Eyer discloses at the cited col. 7 lines 31-32 as follows: "the processor transmits the following URL to the Web site server." The General Motors (GM) stock quote from the site www.stocks.com is then retrieved from the web site server of the internet, according to *Eyer*. That is very different from the present claimed service having a broadcast stream nature, and is unrelated to any kind of streaming data at all.

It is true that the example at col. 7 of *Eyer* can be extended to so-called "Web TV," in which a user may surf the internet using his television set. However, such a service is still tied to an internet web server. In contrast, the present invention establishes a relationship between, on the one hand, data information identifying a broadcast data stream in the broadcast transmission and, on the other hand, a global textual name information used by the broadcasting system to retrieve the service.

The final Office Action relies (in the last paragraph on page 2) upon the following statement in *Eyer*: "the HTML/HTVP data may provide unrelated information such as stock quotes, weather information, airline travel schedules or virtually *any resource* which is constructed with HTML" (emphasis added). There is no motivation for taking the words "any resource" and assuming that this refers to the present claimed streaming broadcast services which, of course, are not even constructed with HTML. Even if there were motivation to combine the cited references, applicant respectfully submits that the parts combined by the Office Action would produce an indefinite combination; a prior art patent that mentions providing "*any resource*" cannot render all future patents obvious.

The Present Amendments

The present amendments are for purposes of clarity, and they introduce several limitations for purposes of expediting allowance of the present claims. The broadcast limitation is already contained in independent claims 12 and 13. Incidentally, note that claims 3 and 16 already say that the data transmission stream is adapted to comply with digital video broadcasting (DVB) definitions. New independent claim 23 has many of the features of claims 17 and 21, but claim 23 provides further detail about how the name information is included in the descriptor table.

Applicants note that a uniform resource locator (URL) such as the one presented by *Eyer* at column 7, line 8 or the one presented at *Eyer's* column 6, line 63 is not "non-numeric." The latter URL contains a "channel=444" part where the real identifier for the service is the number 444. This clearly is numeric. The rest of the URL is just surrounding syntax, and the real identifier in that URL is the numeric identifier 444. If someone's phone number is +358401234567, it does not become non-numeric by writing "phonenumber=+358401234567," i.e. by adding a fixed string that is not the actual identifying part in front of it.

Regarding page four, first paragraph of the final Office Action, the original network ID of *Teresawa* is numeric as well, at column 8, lines 40-50. This original network ID is a label for identifying the network ID serving as the generation source of the delivery system. If one

chooses to interpret the word "label" broadly, then there is no means of ensuring the worldwide uniqueness of these labels.

With respect to the page 5 of the Office Action, along with the last paragraph on page 4, inserting numeric identifiers inside a URL string with fixed textual prefixes does not make the identifier non-numeric. If the numeric identifier original network ID is 203 and the numeric service ID is 763, then writing this as a string "DVB://203.763" does not make the string non-numeric. The identifying part still includes the numbers, and only a fixed set of other characters has been added. It becomes non-numeric only if the actual identifier inside the URL is non-numeric, e.g. "dvb://nelonen.swelcom.fi".

The essential issue here is that inserting numeric identifiers inside a textual URL, where the other characters are just fixed surrounding infrastructure, does not change a URL into a non-numeric identifier.

Referring to page 4 last paragraph of the Office Action, the interpretation of the Admitted Prior Art (APA) is incorrect. The APA at page 6, lines 1-10 of the present application discloses dvb://original_network-id.transport_stream_id.service_id. This format has numeric data information identifying the DVB service, as follows. DVB://123.456.789. Plainly, this is a numeric identifier.

Moreover, the combination of *Terasawa* with *Eyer* does not suggest a reasonable expectation of success, and neither of these references provide adequate motivation for the combination. These references are actually inconsistent and incomplete: *Terasawa* fails to disclose a registration process ensuring the worldwide uniqueness for the service; and, *Eyer* does not associate a URL for the broadcast data stream based service but instead focuses on an internet web site server.

Applicants would now like to draw attention to the Office Action at page 2, third paragraph thru page 3, first paragraph. Applicants maintain that the service name or label presented by *Terasawa* and originally defined in the DVB SI standard (APA), is not a worldwide global identifier. There is no method by which the uniqueness is guaranteed. On the contrary, it is used for displaying to the various end users (at respective locations around the world) many different services that all call themselves "CNN" or "MTV" et cetera.

Applicants note that a worldwide unique identifier must provide a resolution and registration method that guarantees its uniqueness, i.e. that two parties don't independently choose the same label. *Eyer's* URL does not relate to a broadcast data stream based service as in the present claimed invention, but rather provides a generic teaching for internet web TV surfing.

APA and the *Eyer* Reference Do Not Render the Present Invention Obvious

Regarding the Admitted Prior Art (APA), the APA does discuss a worldwide identification algorithm for service identification data. The present claimed invention discloses non-numeric worldwide information for retrieving those service identifications, and the Office Action asserts that this is suggested by *Eyer*. Applicant again respectfully disagrees that this is suggested by *Eyer*.

The Applicant cannot agree that the present invention would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art in view of *Eyer,* especially since the applicant explains essentially the same thing as *Eyer* in the application's discussion of prior art (APA). Of course, *Terasawa* also does not indicate a worldwide unique non-numeric identifier, as the examiner has acknowledged.

Further, columns 11 and 12 of *Eyer* describe using URL-type syntax to control various functions of a television or other household appliance (see column 12, lines 20-23). Of course, controlling household appliances is quite a different field of invention from the present application, and is the antithesis of the worldwide system presently claimed. The present application concerns identifying services worldwide, rather than identifying appliance functions in a household.

It is apparent from *Eyer's* chart at column 11 that *Eyer's* chart is directed toward using a URL-type syntax to increase volume, lower volume, mute the television, and perform other functions that are typically performed by a television remote control, or by the knobs or buttons on a television set or television set-top box. This *Eyer* chart is unrelated to identifying programs or services incoming from a service provider, much less from a service provider having a worldwide identification system and providing a broadcast stream.

If one were to somehow be led to combine the APA with the URL-type-name designations at *Eyer's* columns 11 and 12, then one could easily end up with URL-type-names

that vary from one household to another or from one country to another, even though the URL-type names could be used to retrieve the same service. For example, the name htvp.hello.tv in the United States could easily retrieve the same service as htvp.bonjour.tv in France, whereas htvp.bonjour.tv would not retrieve that service in the United States and htvp.hello.tv would not retrieve that service in France. Such a scheme would be completely contrary to the present claimed invention wherein the name information must be globally individual worldwide, regardless of whether the service identification is globally individual worldwide.

None of the references teach or suggest a combination of name information and service identifications, or that the former (the name information) must be globally individual worldwide, as opposed to the latter (the service identifications) being globally individual worldwide.

At page 5, second paragraph of the final Official Action, reference is made to column 4, lines 40-50 of *Eyer*, and also "col. 3, lines 17-15." Applicant respectfully points out again that "17-15" is erroneous.

Lack of Motivation to Combine the References

The final Office Action states at page 3, second paragraph that motivation to combine is provided by *Eyer*, col. 4, lines 9-17 which purportedly teach the advantages of retrieving TV services using an HTML format. However, *Eyer's* TV graphs, text, and video-on-demand are entirely different from the present claimed streaming broadcasts.

There is nothing in *Teresawa* or *Eyer* or the APA to suggest, teach, or motivate a combination of these three references. Even if there were, the resulting combination would be deficient, as explained above.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the amended claims of the present application define patentable subject matter and are patentably distinguishable over the cited references for the reasons explained. The rejections of the final Official Action of June 20, 2003 having been shown to be inapplicable, retraction thereof is requested, and early passage of the pending claims to issue is earnestly solicited.

Applicants would appreciate if the Examiner would please contact Applicants' attorney by telephone, if that might help to speedily dispose of any unresolved issues pertaining to the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 18, 2003

Andrew T. Hyman
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 45,858

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER
SLUYS & ADOLPHSON LLP
Building Five, Bradford Green
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955